

## REMARKS

The applicants have carefully studied the outstanding Official Action. The present amendment is fully responsive to all points of rejection and the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are hereby respectfully requested.

Claims 75, 77, 100, 150 and 156 are amended, claims 76 and 106 are cancelled without prejudice, and new claim 157 is added.

Claims 75-78, 82-86, 95, 98-100, 103-104, 127-130, 150 and 156 were rejected as being rendered obvious by Darshan (WO 03/010970) in view of Reisman (US 2003/0229900).

Dependent claims 105, 106 and 116 were identified as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. However, in order to expedite prosecution, the applicants have cancelled allowable dependent claim 106 and intervening dependent claim 76 and incorporated their limitations into amended independent claim 75 from which they depended. Corresponding limitations are incorporated into amended independent claims 150 and 156. There are no other independent claims. Dependent claims 77 and 100 are amended to depend from amended independent claim 75 instead of from cancelled dependent claim 76.

New dependent claim 157 has been added, and recites a Headend System to perform the steps of the method of amended independent claim 75.

Therefore, all of the claims now include (directly or indirectly) the limitations of allowable dependent claim 106 (now cancelled), and are allowable.

Withdrawn claims 81, 87-94, 101, 102, 117-125, 131, 132 and 134-137 all depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 75. The applicants respectfully request that those withdrawn claims be re-instated, and that the applicants be permitted to amend those claims to correct dependencies and terminology to be consistent with amendments since the election in June 2008.

Specifically, some of the withdrawn claims depended from claims that have since been cancelled and whose limitations were incorporated into claim 75, some prior amendments would require correction of antecedent bases, and references in the withdrawn claims to "the section" should be changed to "the selection" and references to "the representation of the section" should be changed to "the video and/or audio sequence" consistent with prior amendments to claim 75.

The applicants respectfully request that the Forms PTO SB-08A and 08B submitted with a 2 September 2010 Supplementary Information Disclosure Statement are initialed to document consideration of the references listed in that information disclosure statement.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application, and reinstatement of the withdrawn claims with permission to amend them as discussed above, are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

6 January 2011

HUSCH BLACKWELL LLP  
120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 2200  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 655-1500

  
L. Friedman  
Reg. No. 37,135